



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/772,262	02/06/2004	Hiroki Tamai	248571US6	4438
22850 7590 05/07/2009 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
EXAMINER AMADEZ, RODNEY				
ART UNIT 2629		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 05/07/2009		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com  
oblonpat@oblon.com  
jgardner@oblon.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/772,262

**Applicant(s)**

TAMAI ET AL.

**Examiner**

RODNEY AMADIZ

**Art Unit**

2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 February 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-12 and 14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-12 and 14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fleck et al. (U.S. Patent 6,977,811—herein referred to as "Fleck") in view of Roylance (USPGPUB 2001/0013859—hereinafter "Roylance"), Harada et al. (U.S. Patent 6,072,476—herein referred to as "Harada"), Nakae et al. (USPGPUB 2004/0166829—hereinafter "Nakae") and in further view of Gurne et al. (U.S. Patent 5,541,840—hereinafter "Gurne").

As to **Claim 1**, Fleck teaches an information processing apparatus comprising: a display (**Fig. 1, Reference Number 108**); a main unit (**Figs. 1 and 3**) provided with a keyboard (**110**) having a plurality of operation keys including an enter key ("**return**" **key**); a pointing device configured to move a pointer appearing on the display in a desired direction (**Fleck—Fig. 3, Reference Number 300 and Col. 4, lines 42-45 and 50**); and a plurality of cursor keys (**Fig. 3, Reference Numbers 302, 304, 306 and 308**), the cursor keys being arranged near the pointing device (**Fig. 3—note the position of cursor keys relative to the pointing device and Col. 3, lines 10-28**); and a confirmation button (**300**) configured to confirm an item selected by said pointing device

or said cursor keys (**Col. 4, lines 40-58**), the confirmation button being positioned near said cursor keys (**Fig. 3—note the position of cursor keys (302, 304, 306 and 308) relative to the confirmation button (300)**) and wherein said pointing device, said plurality of cursor keys, and said confirmation button are positioned between said display and said keyboard (**Figs. 1 and 3—note position of common buttons and cursor keys 302-308 near the hinge**).

Fleck's cursor keys; however, are used to incrementally pan the display screen up, down, left and right. Therefore, Fleck, fails to teach the cursor keys are configured to move a cursor appearing on the display in predetermined directions and being different than the pointer. Examiner cites Roylance to teach cursor keys that are configured to both move a cursor appearing on the display in predetermined directions and to incrementally pan the display screen up, down, left and right (**Pg. 3, ¶ 41**). Roylance also teaches that the cursor keys generate the standard ASCII key codes which are different than the codes used to move a pointer. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings of Roylance, that is, utilizing cursor keys that are configured to both move a cursor (which is different than a pointer) appearing on the display in predetermined directions and to incrementally pan the display screen up, down, left and right, in the information processing apparatus taught by Fleck in order to add functionality to the information processing apparatus through the use of multi-functional keys while still keeping the device compact (**Roylance—see Abstract**).

Fleck, as modified by Roylance, also fails to teach a switching button configured to rotate a display screen of said display by 90 degrees and the switching button arranged around an outer periphery of the cursor keys. Examiner cites Harada to teach a switching button (**Fig. 9, Reference Number 65B**) configured to switch a direction of the display (**Col. 11, lines 19-30**). Examiner also cites Harada to teach that the switching button is arranged around an outer periphery of the cursor keys (**80B**). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the use of a switching button as taught by Harada in the information processing apparatus taught by Fleck, as modified by Roylance, in order to provide the user with the option of displaying an image in portrait or landscape (**Harada—Col. 13, lines 17-21**). Furthermore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to arrange the switching button around an outer periphery of the cursor keys as taught by Harada in the information processing apparatus taught by Fleck, as modified by Roylance, in order to allow the user to quickly access the switching button with little movement.

Fleck, as modified by Roylance and Harada, also teaches an auxiliary input button (**Fig. 3, hot key “desktop”**) that is arranged around an outer periphery of the cursor keys (**Fleck—Fig. 3**). Fleck, as modified by Roylance and Harada, however, fails to teach that said confirmation button is arranged around an outer periphery of the cursor keys. Examiner cites Gurne to teach a confirmation button (**Fig. 2, 28**) that is arranged around an outer periphery of the cursor keys (**27**). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to

incorporate an additional confirmation button arranged around an outer periphery of the cursor keys, as taught by Gurne in the information processing apparatus taught by Fleck, as modified by Roylance and Harada, in order to avoid an accidental input (*Gurne, Col. 7, lines 10-20*) by providing the user with a separate confirmation button that may be deliberately pressed when an item is highlighted.

Lastly, Fleck, as modified by Roylance, Harada and Gurne, fails to teach that said confirmation button, said switching button, and the auxiliary input button surround the cursor keys. Examiner cites Nakae to teach an information processing apparatus (*Fig. 1A*) wherein several important and commonly used buttons (*14a, 14c, 14e, 14f, 14g and 14h*) surround cursor keys (*14b*). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings of Nakae (i.e. encircling cursor keys with important and commonly used buttons) in the information processing unit taught by Fleck, as modified by Roylance, Harada and Gurne, in order to provide quicker access to the important buttons (i.e. the confirmation button, the auxiliary input button and the switching button) when using the cursor keys.

As to **Claim 7**, Fleck teaches an information processing apparatus comprising: a display (*Fig. 1, 108*); a main unit (*Figs. 1 and 3*) provided with a keyboard (*110*) having a plurality of operation means (*Fig. 3 note section 110*) for inputting an operation command including enter means for inputting an enter command ("**return**" key); pointing means for moving a pointer appearing on the display in a desired direction (*Fig. 3, Reference Number 300 and Col. 4, lines 42-45 and 50*); cursor moving means (*Fig.*

**3, Reference Numbers 302, 304, 306 and 308)** being arranged near the pointing device (**Fig. 3—note the position of cursor keys relative to the pointing device and Col. 3, lines 10-28**); and confirmation means (**300**) for confirming an item selected by said pointing means or said cursor moving means (**Col. 4, lines 40-58**), the confirmation means positioned near said cursor moving means (**Fig. 3—note the position of cursor keys (302, 304, 306 and 308) relative to the confirmation button (300)**), wherein said pointing means, said cursor means, and said confirmation means are positioned between said display and said keyboard (**Figs. 1 and 3—note position of common buttons and cursor keys 302-308 near the hinge**).

Fleck's cursor keys; however, are used to incrementally pan the display screen up, down, left and right. Therefore, Fleck, fails to teach the cursor keys are configured to move a cursor appearing on the display in predetermined directions and being different than the pointer. Examiner cites Roylance to teach cursor keys that are configured to both move a cursor appearing on the display in predetermined directions and to incrementally pan the display screen up, down, left and right (**Pg. 3, ¶ 41**). Roylance also teaches that the cursor keys generate the standard ASCII key codes which are different than the codes used to move a pointer. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings of Roylance, that is, utilizing cursor keys that are configured to both move a cursor (which is different than a pointer) appearing on the display in predetermined directions and to incrementally pan the display screen up, down, left and right, in the information processing apparatus taught by Fleck in order to add

functionality to the information processing apparatus through the use of multi-functional keys while still keeping the device compact (**Roylance—see Abstract**).

Fleck, as modified by Roylance, also fails to teach a switching means for rotating a display screen of said display by 90 degrees and the switching button arranged around an outer periphery of the cursor keys. Examiner cites Harada to teach a switching means (**Fig. 9, Reference Number 65B**) for rotating a display screen of a display by 90 degrees (**Col. 11, lines 19-30**). Examiner also cites Harada to teach that the switching means is arranged around an outer periphery of the cursor moving means (**80B**). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the use of a switching means as taught by Harada in the information processing apparatus taught by Fleck, as modified by Roylance, in order to provide the user with the option of displaying an image in portrait or landscape (**Harada—Col. 13, lines 17-21**). Furthermore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to arrange the switching means around an outer periphery of the cursor moving means, as taught by Harada in the information processing apparatus taught by Fleck, as modified by Roylance, in order to allow the user to quickly access the switching means with little movement.

Fleck, as modified by Roylance and Harada, also teaches an auxiliary input means (**Fig. 3, hot key “desktop”**) that is arranged around an outer periphery of the cursor moving means (**Fleck—Fig. 3**). Fleck, as modified by Roylance and Harada, however, fails to teach that said confirmation means is arranged around an outer periphery of the cursor moving means. Examiner cites Gurne to teach a confirmation



means (**Fig. 2, 28**) that is arranged around an outer periphery of a cursor moving means (**27**). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate an additional confirmation means that is arranged around an outer periphery of the cursor moving means, as taught by Gurne in the information processing apparatus taught by Fleck, as modified by Roylance and Harada, in order to avoid an accidental input (**Gurne, Col. 7, lines 10-20**) by providing the user with a separate confirmation means that may be deliberately pressed when an item is highlighted.

Lastly, Fleck, as modified by Roylance, Harada and Gurne, fails to teach that said confirmation means, said switching means, and the auxiliary input means surround the cursor moving means. Examiner cites Nakae to teach an information processing apparatus (**Fig. 1A**) wherein several important and commonly used buttons (**14a, 14c, 14e, 14f, 14g and 14h**) surround cursor keys (**14b**). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings of Nakae (i.e. encircling a cursor moving means with important and commonly used buttons/means) in the information processing unit taught by Fleck, as modified by Roylance, Harada and Gurne, in order to provide quicker access to the important buttons (i.e. the confirmation means, the auxiliary input means and the switching means) when using the cursor moving means.

As to **Claims 2 and 8**, Fleck, as modified by Roylance, teaches the cursor keys arranged along the periphery of the pointing device such that the pointing device is at

the center of the cursor keys (***Fig. 3—note the position of cursor keys relative to the pointing device and Col. 3, lines 10-28***).

As to **Claims 5 and 10**, Fleck teaches that the confirmation button/means (**300**) confirms an item selected by said pointing device/means or said cursor keys/moving means by being pressed (***Col. 4, lines 40-58***).

As to **Claim 12**, Fleck teaches that said plurality of cursor keys are arranged around a periphery of the pointing device such that the pointing device is at the center of the cursor keys, and said confirmation key is arranged at a periphery of the cursor keys (***Fleck, Figure 3, note the cursor keys 302-308 arranged around a periphery of the pointing device 300, such that the pointing device is at the center of the cursor keys, and the confirmation key 300 is arranged at the periphery (outside the boundary) of the cursor keys 302-308***).

3. Claims 3 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fleck, Roylance, Harada, Nakae and Gurne as applied to claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 10 and 12 above, and further in view of Boehme et al. (U.S. Patent 6,512,670—herein referred to as “Boehme”).

As to **Claims 3 and 9**, Fleck, as modified by Roylance, Harada, Nakae and Gurne teaches a display unit having a display housing on which the display is provided (***Fig. 1, Reference Number 108 and note the housing it is in***); and a hinge unit which connects the display unit and the main unit such that the display unit can pivot to open and close the **keyboard** (***Fig. 1, note Hinge Unit between the display unit and the***

*main unit*), wherein the pointing device and the cursor keys are positioned near one end of the information processing apparatus along the axis of the hinge in an area between the display unit and the keyboard (***Figs. 1 and 3—note position of pointing device 300 and cursor keys 302-308 along the axis of the hinge and between the display unit and the keyboard***).

Fleck, as modified by Roylance, Harada, Nakae and Gurne, however, fails to teach the hinge unit including a hinge barrel and hinge pins disposed in the hinge barrel. Examiner cites Boehme et al. to teach an information processing apparatus having a hinge unit including a hinge barrel and hinge pins disposed in the hinge barrel (***Figs. 5-6 and Col. 4, lines 4-35***). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the use of a hinge unit as taught by Boehme in the information processing apparatus taught by Fleck, as modified by Roylance, Harada, Nakae and Gurne in order to be able to detach the display from the main unit (***Boehme et al.—Col. 4, lines 4-35***).

4. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fleck and Roylance, Harada, Nakae, Gurne and Boehme as applied to claims 1-3, 5, 7-10 and 12 above, and further in view of Bhatia (U.S. Patent 6,288,895—hereinafter “Bhatia”).

As to **Claim 6**, Fleck, as modified by Roylance, Harada, Nakae, Gurne and Boehme, fails to teach air outlets arranged in a backside of said main unit. Examiner cites Bhatia to teach an air outlet arranged in a backside of a main unit (***Figs. 1 and 4a-4d, air outlets 29 and Col. 3, lines 8-12 and Col. 4, lines 18-19***). At the time the

invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate an air outlet in the back side of a main unit as taught by Bhatia in the information processing apparatus taught by Fleck, as modified by Roylance, Harada, Nakae, Gurne and Boehme, in order to cool the apparatus by removing heat from the heat generating components (**Bhatia—Col. 1, lines 13-17**).

Bhatia, however, fails to specifically teach more than one air outlet arranged on the backside of the main unit. Therefore, Examiner cites *St. Regis Paper Co. V. Bemis Co., Inc.*, 193 USPQ 8, 11 (7<sup>TH</sup> Cir. 1977) to teach that it is well known to duplicate parts to obtain a multiplied effect. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide several air outlets, as supported by the case law above, in the information processing unit taught by Fleck, as modified by Roylance, Harada, Nakae, Gurne, Boehme and Bhatia, in order to cool the device more quickly.

5. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fleck, Roylance, Harada, Nakae and Gurne as applied to claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 10 and 12 above, and further in view of Bhatia.

As to **Claim 11**, Fleck, as modified by Roylance, Harada, Nakae and Gurne fails to teach air outlets arranged in a backside of said main unit. Examiner cites Bhatia to teach an air outlet arranged in a backside of a main unit (**Figs. 1 an 4a-4d, air outlets 29 and Col. 3, lines 8-12 and Col. 4, lines 18-19**). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate

an air outlet in the back side of a main unit as taught by Bhatia in the information processing apparatus taught by Fleck, as modified Roylance, Harada, Nakae and Gurne, in order to cool the apparatus by removing heat from the heat generating components (**Bhatia—Col. 1, lines 13-17**).

Bhatia, however, fails to specifically teach more than one air outlet arranged on the backside of the main unit. Therefore, Examiner cites *St. Regis Paper Co. V. Bemis Co., Inc.*, 193 USPQ 8, 11 (7<sup>TH</sup> Cir. 1977) to teach that it is well known to duplicate parts to obtain a multiplied effect. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide several air outlets, as supported by the case law above, in the information processing unit taught by Fleck, as modified by Roylance, Harada, Nakae and Gurne and Bhatia, in order to cool the device more quickly.

6. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fleck, Roylance, Harada, Nakae and Gurne as applied to claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 10 and 12 above, and further in view of Bertram et al. (U.S. Patent 5,198,802—hereinafter "Bertram").

As to **Claim 14**, Fleck teaches the pointer as "+" icon (**Figures 4-6, 402**). Fleck, as modified by Roylance, Harada, Nakae and Gurne, however, fails to teach that the display displays said cursor as a square and said pointer as an arrow. Examiner cites Bertram to teach that it is well-known in the art to display a cursor as a square and a pointer as an arrow (**Col. 1, lines 30-64**). At the time the invention was made, it would

have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings of Bertram, that is display a cursor as a square and a pointer as an arrow, in the information processing unit taught by Fleck, as modified by Roylance, Harada, Nakae and Gurne, in order to provide a plurality of ways to control the content on a display.

### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 7 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

***Inquiries***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rodney Amadiz whose telephone number is (571) 272-7762. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sumati Lefkowitz can be reached on (571) 272-3638. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/R. A./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2629  
4/30/09

/Sumati Lefkowitz/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629